



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*[Handwritten signature]*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/522,486 03/10/00 TIHON

C 20000018.ORI

EXAMINER
----------

QM32/1219

KEVIN W CYR ESG  
NIKOAI MERSSEREAU & DIETZ P A  
820 INTERNATIONAL CENTRE  
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH  
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402-3813

BROWN, M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3764

DATE MAILED:

12/19/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/52486

Applicant(s)

Claude Tihon

Examiner

Michael Brown

Group Art Unit

3264

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address--

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

## Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.  
Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
  - ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 ✓
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 3764

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Galloway.

Galloway discloses 3A-3B an apparatus comprising a shaft 10, a retention structure (the loop shown in figure 3A), that is non-concentrically disposed along the longitudinal axis of the shaft (note fig. 3A), a lumen 20, a protuberance 14, a lumen (the other 20 coextensive with the shaft) a hydrogel coating (col. 4, lines 23-25), an orientation marking (the threads 18 are markings that are used for orientation), a beveled edge (24 has a beveled edge), a segment of the retention structure defines a cavity (the opening inside of the loop) and a method of treating incontinence.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3764

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- MB 4. Claim <sup>14</sup>13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galloway in view of Kalb '182.

Galloway discloses in figures 3A-3B a method of treating incontinence, substantially as claimed. However, Galloway does not disclose a stylet to render the retention device rectilinear. Kalb teaches in figure 4 a method of treating incontinence comprising inserting a stylet 30 into a lumen 22 to render a retention device rectilinear. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made that the stylet as taught by Kalb could be substituted for the tube as disclosed by Galloway because the tube and the stylet are functionally equivalent in terms of being able to make the retention member rectilinear, yet allow the retention member to return to a circular shape after the tube or stylet is removed.

*Conclusion*

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. No additional prior art was cited during the first office action.
6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Brown whose telephone number is (703) 308-2682.

M. Brown  
December 12, 2000



Michael A. Brown  
Primary Examiner

**ATTACHMENT TO AND MODIFICATION OF**  
**NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY (PTO-37)**  
*(November, 2000)*

**NO EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE PERMITTED TO FILE CORRECTED OR FORMAL DRAWINGS, OR A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION**, notwithstanding any indication to the contrary in the attached Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).

If the following language appears on the attached Notice of Allowability, the portion lined through below is of no force and effect and is to be ignored<sup>1</sup>:

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE to comply with the requirements noted below is set to EXPIRE **THREE MONTHS** FROM THE "DATE MAILED" of this Office action. Failure to comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application. ~~Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).~~

Similar language appearing in any attachments to the Notice of Allowability, such as in an Examiner's Amendment/Comment or in a Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948, is also to be ignored.

---

<sup>1</sup> The language which is crossed out is contrary to amended 37 CFR 1.85(c) and 1.136. See "Changes to Implement the Patent Business Goals", 65 Fed. Reg. 54603, 54629, 54641, 54670, 54674 (September 8, 2000), 1238 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 77, 99, 110, 135, 139 (September 19, 2000)